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AGENDA

The meeting began at 8:00 a.m.

The Chair welcomed the Committee.

Before voting on the Consent agenda, the Chair noted a typographical error on the form for Item 4a in the justification, where “CHM 1091” should read “PHY 1091”. The correction was made without objection.

Also, a comment was made that, for consistency with Items 3a and 4a, the Department of Chemical Engineering should submit a similar change for CHE 1091 – Nanoscience/Nanotechnology Laboratory. Dr. Jon Whitlow (Chemical Engineering) indicated he would speak with the department on the matter.

The following items were unanimously approved.

Consent Agenda:

College of Science
2. Dept. of Biological Sciences  
   a. ANC - BIO 4100 - Special Topics in Biology

3. Dept. of Chemistry  
   a. CRC - CHM 1091 - Nanoscience/Nanotechnology Laboratory

4. Dept. of Physics and Space Sciences  
   a. CRC - PHY 1091 - Nanoscience/Nanotechnology Laboratory

Consent Agenda Discussion Items:

The following item was discussed and unanimously approved.

College of Business
1. Dept. of Extended Studies  
   a. CGR - B.S. Logistics Management

Two issues had arisen: the date of implementation, and a concern that the changes were weakening the foundation that should be a part of any business program.

Dr. Monica Baloga (VP for Institutional Effectiveness) was present and addressed the first issue, but also spoke more broadly on SACS requirements. She distributed a handout (attached) containing some of the SACSCOC principles, requirements, and considerations for undergraduate programs, and briefly touched upon each of them. However, Dr. Baloga expanded her discussion as it related to the sections on “Academic policies” and “Undergraduate program requirements,” noting that the University must publish and disseminate its policies, that it must demonstrate adherence to them, that program requirements must be “clear, complete, and consistent”, and that the UGCC cannot override institutional policy. Related to the
As 2016 on curriculum that consistent with University policy. As such, except only under certain special circumstances, changes to the curriculum will not be implemented/enforced until they appear in the current academic-year catalog.

Dr. Baloga was asked to clarify Principle 1.A.d. on the handout, related to course work for degrees. She explained that the University must demonstrate that for at least one program at the Associate, Bachelor, Master, and Doctoral levels, that the University provides all academic instruction. It was asked if this means within each academic unit, to which the response was “no,” only one program at each level “per University”, not “per department”.

Another question related to co-requisite/prerequisite policies arose. There are many instances where a student may be taking a course sequence where one course is a co-requisite to another (for example, MTH 1002 – Calculus 2 is a co-requisite for PHY 1001 – Physics 1), and the student decides to drop the co-requisite course (MTH 1002 in the example). Does that automatically mean that the student must also drop the second course (PHY 1001), irrespective of the student’s performance in that second course? There are many reasons that an advisor or other faculty member may want to try to keep a student in a course. Dr. Baloga responded “technically, yes” because that is the definition of a co-requisite; if a student can remain in a course while dropping that course’s co-requisite, why is there a co-requisite requirement in the first place? Multiple examples were expressed by the Committee demonstrating why it might be desirable or advisable to keep a student in the second course if its co-requisite course is dropped, such as if a student drops the first course after eight weeks of instruction, they may have already received the requisite knowledge needed for the second course. Another example was that, historically, some students have failed MTH 1001 (Calculus 1) or MTH 1002, but done well in PHY 1001. Dr. Baloga conceded the issue still needs discussion at the University level, but that SACS may inquire why the University is not being rigid in implementing its own policies. The Registrar’s Office also indicated that it needs clear guidance about whether both courses of a co-requisite pair need to be dropped when one of the course pair is being dropped. It was requested that the Registrar’s Office investigate best practices at other universities related to this issue, and then perhaps the Florida Tech policy could be changed or implemented differently to be consistent with what other institutions are doing.

It was asked if all the academic policies were online, to which the response was “yes,” that they can be found on the University website at http://www.fit.edu/policies.

Returning to the B.S. in Logistics Management program on the Consent Agenda, the Chair felt that the first issue had been resolved, and that the program changes would not be implemented until they appear in the 2016-2017 catalog. Everyone agreed, and the form was correspondingly amended.

As to the second issue, Dr. Ted Richardson (Sr. Assoc. Dean/Professor – Extended Studies) was present to address the issue. He explained that the B.S. in Logistics Management program was being used to feed the M.S. in Logistics Management program. There are no prerequisites in the first two years of the program that are needed for courses in the second two years; if there were, they would still appear in the first two years of the program flowchart. He further explained that this is not a general business degree, but a very specialized program.
It was asked why the program had so many free elective courses, particularly the three that appear in the second half of the program. Dr. Richardson explained that this was to give students some flexibility in tailoring the program. For example, the subject of organizational behavior finds its roots in psychology, and it would not be inappropriate for students to take additional courses related to psychology.

It was also asked which courses are used for assessment. Dr. Richardson explained that the students must complete a business research project related to logistics management. Also, because the students transfer in the first two years of the program, they have sufficient humanities and communication courses to satisfy degree requirements, and hopefully a sufficient mastery of those skills. Dr. Baloga noted that this is a general issue related to all transfer students, and at the moment, the University assumes that if a student is transferring from a regionally accredited school, that the courses being transferred in meet the assessment requirements. It was further asked if the changes being proposed in the program impacted the program’s assessment plan, to which (after some clarification) the response was “no.”

Discussion Items:
1. Changes to the CRC/CGR forms. (Raised at meeting/tabled from previous meeting)

At the previous meeting, the Committee discussed modifying the CRC and CGR forms to include checkboxes that would indicate whether changes to the curriculum impacted the program’s assessment plan or Scholarly Inquiry (Q) course(s). This would serve as a reminder to the academic unit and an indicator to the Committee when they might have to address the Scholarly Inquiry requirement. Dr. Baloga’s opinion was sought on the matter after the previous meeting, and she indicated that the idea of the checkboxes would be good, but she didn’t feel it was necessary to include her in the signature block for that purpose. When asked how any assessment impact/changes would be approved, Dr. Baloga indicated that she would take it upon herself to closely monitor the agendas and follow-up with any academic unit that indicates their changes will impact assessment. On a vote of 10-0-1, the Committee approved recommending a change to the CRC and CGR forms as discussed above.

Prior to the end of the meeting, a final question was asked relating to the previous policy discussion, asking for clarification on what curriculum changes that are approved by the Committee would be permitted to be effective in Fall 2015. Dr. Baloga stated that only co-requisite/prerequisite changes would be permitted (because the Registrar’s Office has a compelling interest in assuring that BANNER matches the catalog, but mid-year prerequisite changes would not be permitted next and in following years), and any new, market-driven programs that are approved by Dr. McCoy (Executive Vice-President/Chief Operating Officer). The earliest all other changes would be effective is Fall 2016.

The Chair reminded the Committee that the next meeting is the last for the semester.

Our next regular meeting is Fri., Nov. 21 at 8:00 a.m. in the Physical Sciences conference room. Agenda items are due Fri., Nov. 14.

The meeting ended at 8:52 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mark Archambault – Chair
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Consideration of Undergraduate Education

I. SACSCOC Principles of Accreditation
   A. Core Requirements
      a. CR 2.7.1 Program Length – ensuring 60 semester credit hour minimum for associate degree programs and 120 semester credit hour minimum for baccalaureate degree programs.
      b. CR 2.7.2 Program Content – Coherent course of study compatible with university mission and appropriate to higher education. Benchmarking is expected.
      c. CR 2.7.3 General Education – minimum of 15 and 30 semester credit hours for associate and baccalaureate programs, respectively. To include at least one course from each of the following: humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral sciences, and natural science/mathematics.
      d. CR 2.7.4 Course work for degrees – Institution provides instruction for all course work for at least one degree at each approved level. In cases where institution does not provide all instruction, the institution must demonstrate control of all aspects of its programs.
   B. Comprehensive Standards
      a. CS 3.4.1 Academic program approval – programs for academic credit are approved by faculty and administration.
      b. CS 3.4.10 Responsibility for curriculum – primary responsibility for content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum is of the faculty. Benchmarking is expected.
      c. CS 3.5.2 Institutional credits for a degree (undergraduate) – at least 25% of credit hours required for undergraduate degree are earned through instruction offered by institution awarding credit.
   C. Federal Requirements
      a. FR 4.2 Program curriculum – directly related and appropriate to university mission.
      b. FR 4.4 Program length – appropriate for each program (see CR 2.7.1)
      c. FR 4.9 Definition of credit hours – policies and procedures for determining credit hours awarded for courses and programs that conform to commonly accepted practices in higher education.

II. Institutional Requirements
   a. General Education – determine courses that meet general education component of undergraduate degrees.
   b. Computer literacy/Technology requirement
   c. Scholarly Activity initiative (QEP) – culminating scholarly activity embedded in all baccalaureate degree programs at junior/senior level.
   d. Others?
Important considerations:

CS 3.4.5 Academic policies: The institution publishes academic policies that adhere to principles of good educational practice. These policies are disseminated to students, faculty, and other interested parties through publications that accurately represent the programs and services of the institution.
  - These policies are required by SACSCOC and each institution must demonstrate adherence to these academic policies.

CS 3.5.3 Undergraduate program requirements: The institution publishes requirements for its undergraduate programs, including its general education components. These requirements conform to commonly accepted standards and practices for degree programs.
  - All appropriate publications must provide clear, complete, and consistent information about each program.